SUSAN EHRLICH, *Point of View. A Linguistic Analysis of Literary Style*, London & New York, Routledge, 1990, X + 132 p.

Point of View. A Linguistic Analysis of Literary Style proposes an examination of *represented speech and thought* (RST), a style or discourse mode used mainly in narrative fiction express the character's point of view, also known as *free indirect discourse* (FID). The book furnishes a breakthrough from a discourse analytic perspective on the account of RST by giving an explicit formulation of the aspects that cannot be handled within sentence linguistics, as well as by offering a convincing explanation of how this mode functions as a semantically and pragmatically distinct textual unit. Ehrlich discusses such issues as the demarcation of RST, its delimitation from indirect and direct discourses, the limitations of sentence-based approaches, and examines the inter-sentential coherence of this mode by highlighting the relevance of discourse context. In particular, she elaborates much needed tests for cross-sentential point of view coherence, and furnishes essential evidence as to how passages of RST hang together.

The literature on RST or FID differs depending on the weight given to various categories of features in the constitution of this discourse mode. The *syntactic accounts* are sentence-based and define RST purely on the basis of linguistic characteristics, the major features being represented, in this view, by the peculiar person and tense marking (third person of the personal pronoun with first person deixis, special tense system based on past tense forms with possible present and future time deixis), and by the occurrence of idiosyncratic lexical elements (e.g. colloquialisms, slangy words), or of lexical items belonging to various (nonliterary) registers. The presence of specific deictic and indexical elements (e.g. *this, here, now)* in conjunction with the past tense verb forms has also been considered, as well as the occurrence of emotive language, exclamations, and interrogative subject-auxiliary inversion. They cannot be attributed to the narrator, since they evoke another voice or perspective. Ehrlich gives careful consideration to the syntactic features, but restricts their relevance to the intrasentential domain, given that they can only signal the "emergence" (p. 17) of another perspective, therefore accounting for the "internally marked" (p. 27) sentences of RST. The major problem is represented, according to her, by the linguistically unmarked sentences of RST, which is evidence of the insufficient reliability of purely syntactic criteria in determining the status of particular RST sentences. The position according to which syntax plays the determining role in the marking of RST or FID has not gone unquestioned, and this has given rise to *semantic* and *pragmatic approaches* in the literature, which either assign semantic and pragmatic pertinence to syntactic evidence (e. g. S.-Y. Kuroda, *Reflections on the Foundation of Narrative Theory*, in T. A. van Dijk (ed), *Pragmatics of Language and Literature*, New Holland, 1976, p. 107-140; Ann Banfield, *Unspeakable Sentences*, London, 1982), or emphasize the role of context and previously supplied information in determining the RST status of given textual segments (e.g. Dorrit Cohn, *Transparent Minds*, Princeton, 1978; Brian McHale, *Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Accounts*, in PTL, 3, 1978, p. 249-287). Now, Ehrlich gives the first global explicit formulation of these aspects. Especially important are, in her study, the discourse means that sustain sentence connectedness within RST passages, or coherence of point of view across sentence boundaries, since they can account for the sentences not explicitly marked as RST, i.e. the ones with a syntactically ambiguous status. Since discourse context is relevant to such an investigation, Ehrlich proposes a discourse analytic approach which emphasizes those aspects whereby RST is demarcated as a coherent episode, most important among them being the inter-sentential linguistic features of *referential linking* and *semantic connector linking* (pp. 40-57), *temporal linking* (pp. 58-80), and *progressive aspect* (pp. 81-94). She argues that the first three facilitate cross-sentential interpretations of RST by linking sentences that are textually cohesive with discourse containing syntactically marked sentences of RST *(explicit* coherence or cohesion), while the last (progressive aspect) may sustain point of view coherence that is only *implicit*, i.e.

not textually explicit. The result is a comprehensive account of how RST or FID as a semantically and pragmatically distinct textual unit is associated with the character's personal perspective of the events. Relevant to this is, among other things, Ehrlich's contention (p. 75) that parenthetical verbs of communication and consciousness, as well as parenthetical predicates denoting characters' perceptions (so typical of RST) or even characters' physical activities are character-oriented, sustaining sentence connectedness and coherence of point of view. So the analysis furnishes, too, essential evidence in favor of subsuming under RST not only the representation of verbal events and of mental events including thoughts, but also of mental states like perceptions, visions or fantasies.

Below, as an unpretentious and informal illustration, I will analyze, along lines suggested by Ehrlich, a brief passage by James Joyce ("Eveline". In *Dubliners*. New York: The Viking Press, 1965), which contains syntactically unmarked FID sentences that depend for their interpretation on the discourse context:

[a]She sat at the window watching the evening invade the avenue....

[b]Few people passed. [c]The man out of the last house passed on his way home; .... (p. 36).

There is no linguistic feature in this example that would require [b] and [c] to be interpreted unambiguously as FID, since, isolated from the context, they might be attributed to the narrator. On closer examination, however, it turns out that [b] and [c] are constituted into FID by temporal linking, across paragraph boundaries, to [a], whose predicate, by designating the character's physical activity and perception, provides a reference time for the tense of the respective sentences and identifies them as reflecting the point of view of "she", that is Eveline, the protagonist. Besides temporal linking, semantic content is also responsible for the FID interpretation, since the sentence contains information accessible to the character, behaving like a semantic "complement" (p. 67) of the controlling verb. It follows that discourse context, which is essential to the cross-sentential constitution of FID, can be handled successfully in terms of cohesive relations, following Ehrlich's suggestions. Unambiguous interpretations for syntactically ambiguous FID sentences can thereby be provided, which indicates the strength of her model.

While the book is essential for our understanding of RST, a somewhat better coverage of the problematics of this discourse mode would have been very useful. In this respect, an issue on which the book is silent is that of double-voicedness or polyvocality of RST (fusion of the narrator's and the character's languages). This would imply a distinct definition of this mode (see McHale, *op. cit.*; Şt. Oltean, *A Survey of the Pragmatic and Referential Functions of Free Indirectn Discourse*, in "Poetics Today", *14*, 1993, 4, p. 691-714), since, if RST or FID is not single-voiced, then it also undergoes a marking for the narrator, in addition to the character, and does not express the point of view of the latter unambiguously, as Ehrlich claims. Likewise, an examination of the valences of RST in contrast with those of interior monologue--a related mode--would have yielded a clearer picture of the position of the former among the styles or modes involved in the representation of speech and thought. However, with regard to the major issues relating to how RST is constituted and hangs together as a distinct textual unit, as well as to what can be subsumed under this mode, Ehrlich's book brings, needless to say, very important clarifications, standing as an extremely illuminating and valuable contribution to the analysis of represented speech and thought, and of the way in which it expresses point of view in narrative fiction.

ŞTEFAN OLTEAN
Universitatea „Babeş-Bolyai"
Facultatea de Litere
Cluj-Napoca, str. Horea, 31